

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed September 24, 2003. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-16 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-16. The present Response amends claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-16, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-16. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-16 under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated that it was not clear what the Applicants intended to claim from the preamble. Applicant has amended the preamble to comply with language that the Examiner indicated would be acceptable. Applicant respectfully submits this rejection has been overcome and request the rejection be withdrawn. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce the original claims in subsequent continuation or divisional application.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

The claimed invention is patentably distinguishable over Prabhakaran in view of Chojnacki

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent No. 5,904,727 (Prabhakaran) in view of United States patent No. US6,366,851 (Chojnacki). Applicant has amended claim 1 and respectfully submits claim 1 is condition to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Prabhakaran discloses a system for tracking the location of mobile transmitter units, retrieving vector location information from the mobile transmitter units, determining an icon representing the mobile tracking

unit, and displaying the icon on a geographical area (col. 2, line 55 through col. 3, line 30). Prhabhakaran does not disclose defining a plurality of radials and associating at least one item relating to said anchor point with each of said plurality of radials. Chojnakci discloses a system for collecting and processing data regarding the positions of roads. Data acquired from moving vehicles is processed by a program that determines new coordinates to adjust the represented positions to align with the centerlines of the represented roads (col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 10). In particular, data points taken from a moving vehicle are used to centerline shift the position of a road. For example, at a curved point in the road represented by many protoshape point (Fig. 21A), a curvature point is determined by connecting two or more points(21B), a radial line through the curve is determined at one point (21C), and a new point is determined at the shift distance (21D). Thus, calculations are made for a plurality of points at a time as illustrated in FIG. 20B, not any one single point. Chojnakci does not disclose defining a plurality of radials and associating at least one item relating to said anchor point with each of said plurality of radials.

The invention claimed in claim 1 recites the elements of identifying an anchor point, defining a plurality of radials extending from said anchor point, and associating at least one item relating to said anchor point with each of said plurality of radials. As discussed above, neither Prhabhakaran or Chojnakci disclose, hint, or suggest these elements. Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as claimed in claim 1 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The claimed invention is patentably distinguishable over Prabhakaran in view of Chojnakci and Esposito

Claims 3, 4 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prabhakaran in view of Chojnakci and United States Patent No. 6,101,496 (Esposito). Examiner states that Esposito discloses interpolating positions from a respective radial corresponding to each of outside data matches corresponding to

the respective radial and placing a marker at each interpolated of the respective radial. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiners characterization of Esposito.

Esposito discloses a method of improving geocoding interpolation by combining ordered data with prior geocoded data to locate addresses on a map. As shown in FIG. 3-1, OI data records 22 are compared against an existing georeferenced library 32. Esposito then classifies the assignment of the address location to one of a group of classification headings, from best case location assignment to unmatched.

Nowhere in Esposito are any of the elements of claim 1 disclosed. The portions of Esposito cited by Examiners disclose determining zip code precision data matching such as five digit zip codes + additional digits for further precision (col. 1, lines 59-67, col. 2, lines 1-45, and col. 6, lines 22-41), adding records to databases (col. 5, lines 1-39 and 64-67), creating a library (col. 6, lines 1-9), and the display of a marker on an address (col. 7, lines 39-53). Esposito does not disclose defining a plurality of radials and associating at least one item relating to said anchor point with each of said plurality of radials. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 4 and 6-16 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Prabhakaran, Chojnacki and Esposito and request the rejection be withdrawn.

Additionally, Claims 3, 4 and 6-16 are dependent on allowable claim 1 and therefore allowable for the reasons stated above in addition to the distinguishing elements they recite. Additionally, since Esposito does not disclose the concept of a radial as discussed above, Esposito does not disclose the invention as claimed in claim 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 16 which recite limitations regarding a radial. Applicant further submits that it is not obvious to arrive at the satellite limitations recited in claims 8 and 9 because none of the cited references relate to, teach, hint or suggest any technical matter related to satellite mapping nor are they in the same technical field as satellite mapping. Furthermore, Prabhakaran clearly does not disclose assigning a direction to each respective radial as recited in claims 12 and 13 and calculating an endpoint for each respective radial in claim 12. The corresponding text cited by the Examiner relates to a shifting map illustrated on an electronic

screen, which differs from the elements in claims 12 and 13. Applicant further submits that it would not be obvious to have a margin of error in the cited references as stated by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in position to overcome this rejection and requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

Conclusion


In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 23, 2003

By: _____


Stephen R. Bachmann
Reg. No. 50,806

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800